## 

1 2 3 4 5 6 7	GARRICK S. LEW (State Bar No. 61889) LAW OFFICE OF GARRICK S. LEW 600 Townsend Street Suite 329 E San Francisco, CA 94103 Telephone: (415) 575-3588 Facsimile: (415) 522-1506  Attorneys for Defendant SERGIO ENRIQUE FERREY-GOMEZ
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, )
11	) CR 05-00722-JF Plaintiff, )
12	vs.  STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER  FOR CONTINUANCE AND EXCLUSION  OF TIME INDEP SPEEDY TRIAL ACT
13 14	SERGIO ENRIQUE FERREY-GOMEZ,  )  OF TIME UNDER SPEEDY TRIAL ACT, 18 U.S.C. § 3161
15	Defendant. )
16	The United States, through its counsel John Glang, and defendant Sergio Enrique Ferrey-Gomez,
17	through his counsel Garrick S. Lew, hereby agree and stipulate to continue the hearing in this case
18	scheduled for April 5, 2006, 9:00 a.m. to the new date of May 3, 2006, at 9:00 a.m. for case status and
19	motion setting. The parties further stipulate that the Court may exclude the period of time from April
20	5, 2006 through and including May 3, 2006 from the computation of the period of time within which
21	the trial must commence for the reasons set forth in the proposed order below.
22	The parties have spoken and agreed and request that the Court vacate the April 5, 2006 case
23	status hearing and continue defendant's hearing to May 3, 2006, at 9:00 a.m. for case status.
24	SO STIPULATED.
25	March 28, 2006
26	GARRICK LEW
27	Counsel for Sergio Enrique Ferrey-Gomez
28	

## Case 5:05-cr-00722-JF Document 23 Filed 03/30/06 Page 2 of 2

March 29, 2006 Assistant United States Attorney **ORDER** Based on the stipulation of the parties IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the hearing scheduled for April 5, 2006, at 9:00 a.m. be vacated and that the parties appear on May 3, 2006 at 9:00 a.m. for the status hearing in this case. Pursuant to Title 18, United States Code, section 3161(h) the Court excludes the period of time from April 5, 2006 through and including May 3, 2006 from the computation of the period of time within which the trial must commence. The Court FINDS that the ends of justice served by the delay outweigh the best interest of public and the defendants in a speedy trial. The Court bases this finding on the need to afford defense counsel additional time to review discovery including the anticipated receipt of significant quantities of wire tap recordings and related documents as well as the defense's need to analyze forensic data and prepare to file pretrial motions. It is so ordered: DATED: 3/30/06 District Judge